

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities .....	iii
Statement of Basis of Appellate Jurisdiction .....	1
Statement of Standard of Review .....	1
Summary of Argument .....	2
Statement of the Case .....	5
Argument .....	11
A. The U.S. Supreme Court Has Expressly Authorized Chapter 11 Counsel to Recover Reasonable Transition Costs From a Retainer Following a Chapter 7 Conversion .....	11
B. Under The <u>Lamie</u> Case and Massachusetts Law, R&G is Entitled to Recover Fees for Post-Conversion Date Services from Its Court Authorized Security Retainer Because These Services Were Required in Connection with Termination of R&G's Engagement .....	14
C. R&G is Entitled to Recover Fees for Post-Conversion Date Services Because These Fees are Chapter 11 Administrative Claims Incurred As A Result of R&G's Engagement in the Chapter 11 Case Regardless of When the Services Were Actually Provided .....	16
D. Under The Plain Error Standard of Review, The Legal Issues That The U.S. Trustee Raises For the First Time On Appeal And New Factual Statements in The U.S. Trustee's Brief on Appeal That Contradict the U.S. Trustee's Answers to Questions Posed By The Bankruptcy Court At Oral Argument Need Not Be Considered By This Court .....	20
1. The U.S. Trustee Failed to Raise Any Objection in the Bankruptcy Court to the Portion of R&G's Final Fee Application That Seeks Reimbursement for the Expenses of Preparing the R&G Final Fee Application .....	22

<b>2. The U.S. Trustee Cannot Rewrite the Trial Court Record and Deny the U.S. Trustee's Admission that Chapter 11 Counsel Has "Continuing Post-Conversion Duties" .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3. On Appeal, the U.S. Trustee Abandons the Only Argument Asserted Before the Bankruptcy Court, That "Flat Fee" Retainers Are the Only Type of Retainer That Qualifies for the Retainer Exception in the <u>Lamie</u> Case.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4. The U.S. Trustee's Federal Preemption Argument Should Be Rejected Because It Has No Merit and Because It is Raised For The First Time On Appeal.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5. The U.S. Trustee's Argument That R&amp;G's Retainer is Unenforceable Under Massachusetts Law Should be Rejected Because It Has No Merit and Because It Is Raised For the First Time On Appeal .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>E. The U.S. Trustee's Appeal of the Motion to Reconsider Should be Denied Because the Unpublished Opinion Appended to the Motion Does Not Constitute Newly Discovered Evidence or Establish a Manifest Error of Law or Fact .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Statutory Addendum .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Certificate of Service.....</b>	<b>46</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### FEDERAL CASES

<u>Aero-Fastener, Inc. v. Sierracin Corp. (In re Aero-Fastener, Inc.)</u> , 177 B.R. 120 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1994).....	28, 30
<u>In re Albrecht</u> , 233 F.3d 1258 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).....	15
<u>Aybar v. Crispin-Reyes</u> , 118 F.3d 10 (1st Cir. 1997), <i>cert. denied</i> , 522 U.S. 1078 (1998) and <i>cert. denied sub nom. Laboy v. Crispin-Reyes</i> , 522 U.S. 1078 (1998) .....	29-30
<u>B &amp; T Masonry Constr. Co., Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Mut. Ins. Co.</u> , 382 F.3d 36 (1st Cir. 2004).....	2
<u>In re Bank of New England Corp.</u> , 134 B.R. 450 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1991), <i>aff'd</i> , 142 B.R. 584 (D. Mass 1992).....	19, 22
<u>Borg-Warner Corp. v. Paragon Gear Works, Inc.</u> , 355 F.2d 400 (1st Cir. 1965), <i>cert. dismissed</i> 384 U.S. 935 (1966).....	2
<u>Brook Vill. N. Assocs. v. Gen. Elec. Co.</u> , 686 F.2d 66 (1st Cir. 1982) .....	2
<u>Butner v. United States</u> , 440 U.S. 48 (1979).....	14
<u>In re Channel Master Holdings, Inc.</u> , 309 B.R. 855 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004).....	13, 29
<u>Clauson v. Smith</u> , 823 F.2d 660 (1st Cir. 1987).....	23
<u>DeNadai v. Preferred Capital Mkts., Inc.</u> , 272 B.R. 21 (D. Mass. 2001) .....	1
<u>Dichner v. United States</u> , 348 F.2d 167 (1st Cir. 1965).....	2
<u>In re Ducey</u> , 160 B.R. 465 (Bankr. D. N.H. 1993).....	13
<u>In re Equip. Servs., Inc.</u> , 290 F.3d 739 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002), <i>aff'd sub. nom. Lamie v. United States Trustee</i> , 540 U.S. 526 (2004) .....	15
<u>In re E-Z Serve Convenience Stores, Inc.</u> , 299 B.R. 126 (Bankr. M.D. N.C. 2003), <i>aff'd</i> , 318 B.R. 637 (M.D. N.C. 2004).....	27
<u>In re Hathaway Ranch P'ship</u> , 116 B.R. 208 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1990).....	13

<u>Indian Motorcycle Assocs. III Ltd. P'ship v. Massachusetts Hous. Fin. Agency</u> , 66 F.3d 1246 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1995) .....	3, 25
<u>Lamie v. United States Trustee</u> , 540 U.S. 526 (2004) .....	<i>passim</i>
<u>In re Mahendra</u> , 131 F.3d 750 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997), <i>cert. denied sub. nom. Snyder v. DeWoskin</i> , 523 U.S. 1107 (1998) .....	15
<u>McCoy v. Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.</u> , 950 F.2d 13, 22 (1st Cir. 1991), <i>cert. denied</i> , 504 U.S. 910 (1992) .....	20, 26
<u>In re Milwaukee Engraving Co.</u> , 219 F.3d 635 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), <i>cert. denied sub. nom. Maier, McIlhenny &amp; Kerkman, Ltd. v. Bodenstein</i> , 531 U.S. 1112 (2001) .....	15
<u>In re On-Line Servs. Ltd.</u> , 324 B.R. 342 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. BAP 2005) .....	15
<u>Paradigm Advanced Techs., Inc.</u> , Chapter 7, Case No. 03-13424 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. 2004) .....	29-30
<u>In re Pine Valley Mach., Inc.</u> , 172 B.R. 481 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1994) .....	9, 11, 22
<u>Poliquin v. Garden Way, Inc.</u> , 989 F.2d 527 (1st Cir. 1993) .....	23
<u>Rosen v. Lawson-Hemphill, Inc.</u> , 549 F.2d 205 (1st Cir. 1976) .....	20
<u>In re Roundwood Corp.</u> , 72 B.R. 296 (Bankr. D. S.C. 1987) .....	16
<u>Templeman v. Chris Craft Corp.</u> , 770 F.2d 245 (1st Cir. 1985), <i>cert. denied</i> , 474 U.S. 1021 (1985) .....	2
<u>United States v. Duarte</u> , 246 F.3d 56 (1st Cir. 2001) .....	2
<u>United States v. Gonsalves</u> , 735 F.2d 638 (1st Cir. 1984) .....	20
<u>United States v. Griffin</u> , 818 F.2d 97 (1st Cir. 1987), <i>cert. denied</i> , 484 U.S. 844 (1987) .....	2
<u>United States v. Mulinelli-Navas</u> , 111 F.3d 983 (1st Cir. 1997) .....	1
<u>United States v. Zannino</u> , 895 F.2d 1, 17 (1st Cir. 1990), <i>cert. denied sub nom. Zannino v. United States</i> , 494 U.S. 1082 (1990) .....	23
<u>In re Wedgestone Fin.</u> , 142 B.R. 7 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1992) .....	29-30

## STATE CASES

<u>Commonwealth v. Burbank</u> , 27 Mass. App. Ct. 97, 534 N.E.2d 1180 (1989).....	16
<u>Goodrich v. Wilson</u> , 119 Mass. 429 (1876) .....	27

## FEDERAL STATUTES AND RULES

11 U.S.C. § 327 .....	11, 16, 20, 25-26
11 U.S.C. § 329 .....	12
11 U.S.C. § 330 .....	2, 11-14, 16, 19-20
11 U.S.C. § 341(d) .....	10, 19
11 U.S.C. § 521(3) .....	19
11 U.S.C. § 726(b) .....	16-17
28 U.S.C. § 158(a) .....	1
Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8001(a) .....	1
Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1019(5)(A) .....	18
Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1007 .....	18
Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2003 .....	19

## LOCAL RULES

Mass. Local Bankr. R. 1007-1 .....	19
Mass. Local Bankr. R. 2016-1 .....	
Mass. Local Bankr. R. 2091-1 .....	18
Mass. Local Bankr. R. 9013-1 .....	21
Mass. Sup. Jud. Ct. R. 3:07, R. Prof. Conduct 1.16(d) .....	16, 19
Mass. Sup. Jud. Ct. R. 3:07, R. Prof. Conduct 1.16(e) .....	19



# **APPENDIX OF APPELLEE INDEX**

<u>Document</u>	<u>Tab No.</u>
Transcript of September 7, 2004 Hearing on Final Application of Ropes & Gray LLP for Compensation and Expenses as Counsel to Debtor.....	1
Memorandum of Decision on United States Trustee's Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Final Application for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel to the Debtor.....	2
Order Granting Motion of Debtor for Authorization of the Retention of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel.....	3
Final Application for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel to the Debtor .....	4
Debtor's Application for Order Under 11 U.S.C. §§ 327(a) and 504 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2014 and 2016 and MLBR 2014-1 Authorizing Employment and Retention of Ropes & Gray LLP as Attorneys for Debtor-In-Possession and Statement Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 329(a).....	5
Order Approving Bidding Procedures and Breakup Fee .....	6
Motion for Conversion of Case from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7 .....	7
Motion of Debtor for an Order Amending the Case Caption.....	8
Order Converting Case from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7.....	9
Certificate of Appointment of Interim Trustee and Fixing of Bond.....	10
Transcript of November 23, 2004 Hearing on Motion of the United States Trustee to Reconsider Order Allowing Compensation and Expenses of Ropes & Gray, LLP, as Counsel to the Debtor; Objection by Ropes & Gray, LLP.....	11
United States Trustee's Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Final Application for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel to the Debtor .....	12
Objection of Ropes & Gray LLP to the United States Trustee's Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Final Application for	

Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel to the Debtor .....	13
Notice of Hearing on Final Application for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as counsel to the Debtor and Certificate of Service .....	14
Notice of Nonevidentiary Hearing.....	15

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

In Re: CK Liquidation Corporation  
Debtor,

Chapter: 7  
Case No: 03-44906  
Judge Henry J. Boroff

NOTICE OF NONEVIDENTIARY HEARING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a hearing will be held on 9/7/04 at 11:00 AM before the Honorable Judge Henry J. Boroff, Courtroom 4, Harold Donohue, Federal Building & Courthouse, 595 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01608 to consider the following:

Doc.#[299] Final Application for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Ropes & Gray LLP as Counsel to the Debtor.

OBJECTION/RESPONSE DEADLINE:  
(If left blank, response deadline shall be governed by the Local Rules.)

THE MOVING PARTY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR:

1. Serving a copy of this notice upon all parties entitled to notice forthwith; and
2. Filing a certificate of service with respect to this notice (7) days after the date of issuance set forth below. If the hearing date is less than (7) days from the date of issuance, the certificate of service must be filed no later than the time of the hearing. **If the movant fails to timely file a certificate of service, the court may deny the motion without a hearing.**

NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES SERVED:

1. **Your rights may be affected.** You should read these papers carefully and discuss them with your attorney, if you have one in this bankruptcy case. If you do not have an attorney, you may wish to consult one.
2. Any request for a continuance **MUST** be made by **WRITTEN MOTION**. (See MLBR 5071-1)
3. The above hearing shall be **nonevidentiary**. If, in the course of the nonevidentiary hearing, the court determines the existence of a disputed and material issue of fact, the court will schedule a further evidentiary hearing. **If this is a hearing under section 362**, it will be a consolidated preliminary and final nonevidentiary hearing unless at the conclusion thereof the court sets down an evidentiary hearing.
4. Deadlines to file an objection or response shall be governed by the Local Rules, unless otherwise ordered by the Court. If no objection is timely filed, the Court, in its discretion, may cancel the hearing and rule on the motion without a hearing or further notice. [See MLBR 9013-1(f)].

Date: 8/3/04

By the Court,

Yingmay Steele  
Deputy Clerk  
(508) 770- 8963